

REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed on February 3, 2009. Claims 1-46 are currently pending in the application, with Claims 1, 24 and 44 being in independent form. By this amendment, independent Claims 1, 24 and 44 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that the claims pending in the application, namely Claims 1-46, are fully supported by the specification, introduce no new subject matter, and are patentable over the prior art. Favorable review is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 24, and 44 have been amended to indicate that the probes are “securely in with the bottom surface” as taught and described on page 11 of the application lines 14 through 16. Applicant believes this amendment is fully supported by the specification and overcomes the examiner’s earlier rejection.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 6, 8 and 24

Claims 1, 6, 8 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bohlen et al (US 3,764,898, hereinafter “Bohlen”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims. It is respectfully submitted that Bohlen does not describe or suggest the limitations of Applicants’ claims.

Bohlen describes a non-contact method of testing the electrical continuity of a conductor line by use of an electron beam. FIG. 1 of Bohlen describes a conductor 1 embedded in a carrier 2 and having conductor ends 3 and 4. Collectors 13 and 14 of metal layer 12 “function to catch the secondary electrons leaving the respective adjacent conductor end 3, 4.” Column 2, lines 65-58. However, Bohlen does not describe or suggest the recited “an array of

probes in physical contact to said bottom surface conductive features, as claimed in independent Claims 1 and 24. In contrast and as clearly shown in Bohlen's FIG. 1, collectors 13, 14 are clearly physically isolated from conductor feature 1 and further are not in contact with the bottom surface but above the top surface. The only structure shown below the bottom surface are terminals 16 and 17 which are not probes and applicant submits were placed below the bottom surface for the draftsman's convenience not to show probes in contact with the Bottom Surface of the conductive features. As can clearly be seen from Figure 1 of Bohlen, all of the elements of Bohlen are above the Top Surface of the conductive features. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 24 are believed to be patentable over Bohlen. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 6 and 8 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 1, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given above for independent Claim 1. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-4 and 25-27

Claims 2-4 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohlen in view of Lagowski (US 6,538,462). Claims 2-4 and 25-27 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1 and 24, respectively. Therefore, Claims 2-4 and 25-27 are patentable for at least the reasons given above for independent Claims 1 and 24. As was pointed out above none of the structures in Bohlen are in contact with the bottom surface of the conductive features. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 2-4 and 25-27 be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 28

Claims 5 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohlen in view of Wakalopoulos (US 3,970,892). Claims 5 and 28 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1 and 24, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given above for independent Claims 1 and 24. As was pointed out above none of the structures in Bohlen are in contact with the bottom surface of the conductive features. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 7-17, 29-38 and 44-46

Claims 7-17, 29-38 and 44-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohlen. Claims 7-17 and 29-38 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1 and 24, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given above for independent Claims 1 and 24. As was pointed out above none of the structures in Bohlen are in contact with the bottom surface of the conductive features. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

With regards to Claims 44-46, it is respectfully submitted that Bohlen does not describe or suggest the recited “creating a drain current into an array of probes in continual physical contact with said bottom surface conductive features”, of independent Claim 44. As discussed hereinabove with respect to independent Claims 1 and 24, collectors 13, 14 of Bohlen are not in continual physical contact with conductor feature 1. Accordingly, independent Claim 44 is believed to be patentable over Bohlen. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 45 and 46 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 44 and 24, respectively, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given above for independent Claims 44 and 24 hereinabove. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 18-23 and 39-43

Claims 18-23 and 39-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohlen in view of Nishioka et al. (US 6,043,665). Claims 18-23 and 39-43 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1 and 24, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given above for independent Claims 1 and 24. As was pointed out above none of the structures in Bohlen are in contact with the bottom surface of the conductive features. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims pending in this application, namely Claims 1-46 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early and favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone or personal interview may facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, he is respectfully requested to contact Applicants undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Applicants hereby request an extension of time for reply within two months under 37 CFR § 136(a). Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 09-0458.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Ian David MacKinnon/

Ian David MacKinnon
Reg. No. 34,660
Attorney for Applicants
Phone: (845) 894-4713

International Business Machines Corporation

D/18G, B/321, Zip 482
2070 Route 52
Hopewell Junction, NY 12533
Phone: (845) 894-4713
Fax: (845) 892-6363